Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No 9,079,107

Filed on behalf of Supercell Oy

By:

DOCKET

RAJIV P. PATEL, Reg. No 39,327 BRIAN HOFFMAN, Reg. No. 39,713 JENNIFER R. BUSH, Reg. No. 50,784 KEVIN X. McGANN, Reg. No. 48,793 MICHAEL J. SACKSTEDER (*pro hac vice*) GEOFFREY R. MILLER (*pro hac vice*) EMILY J. BULLIS (*pro hac vice*) FENWICK & WEST LLP 801 California Street Mountain View, CA 94041 Telephone: (650) 988-8500 Facsimile: (650) 938-5200

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SUPERCELL OY, Petitioner

v.

GREE, INC., Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review No. Patent 9,079,107 B2

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,079,107

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I.	INTR	ODUCTION1	
II.		PLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR A PETITION <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW1	
	A.	Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. §42.104(a))1	
	B.	Fees for Inter Partes Review (37 C.F.R. §42.15(a))1	
	C.	Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b))2	
	D.	Designation of Lead and Backup Counsel (37 CFR §42.8(b)(3))	
III.	THRI	ESHOLD FOR REVIEW (35 U.S.C. §314(A))	
IV.	IDEN	TIFICATION OF CLAIMS BEING CHALLENGED	
V.	OVE	RVIEW OF THE '107 PATENT4	
	A.	Effective Filing Date of the Challenged Claims4	
	B.	Background of the Purported Invention4	
	C.	'107 Patent Description5	
	D.	Prosecution History	
VI.	CLAIM INTERPRETATION1		
VII.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART11		
VIII.	OVE	RVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART12	
	A.	The features of the '107 patent were common in gaming long before the alleged invention	
	B.	Englman17	
	C.	Ronen	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	D.	Schulhof25
	E.	Thompson
IX.		OUND I: CLAIMS 1-7 AND 9-11 ARE RENDERED /IOUS BY ENGLMAN, RONEN, AND SCHULHOF
	A.	Englman, Ronen, and Schulhof Render Obvious Independent Claim 1
		1. Englman and Ronen teach "a game control method carried out by a game control device …"
		 Englman teaches "storing skill level information …" as recited in claim 1
		3. Englman teaches "grouping the plurality of users …" as recited in claim 1
		4. Englman and Schulhof teach "providing one or more of a plurality of game pieces …" as recited in claim 1
		5. Englman teaches "storing allocation information" as recited in claim 1
		6. Englman teaches "determining whether all of the game pieces required to obtain said game item have been provided" as recited in claim 1
		 Englman teaches "allocating the game item" as recited in claim 1
	B.	The embodiments of providing of ribbons, medals, and trophies in Englman also teaches elements of claims 1, 9, and 10
	C.	Englman and Ronen teach "creating,a new group" as recited in claim 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

D.	Englman teaches "allowing a userto join a group only if the game control device has received approval" as recited in claim 3	46
E.	Englman and Schulhof teach "the plurality of game pieces are respectively provided to users with skill levels in different ranges, based on the skill level information" and that the game pieces may be provided to users "with different probabilities" as recited in claims 4-5	47
F.	Englman and Schulhof teach "each of the plurality of game pieces is only provided to users with skill levels in a predetermined range, based on the skill level information" as recited in claim 6	50
G.	Englman teaches "only one of the plurality of game pieces is provided to each of the first plurality of users" as recited in claim 7	51
Н.	Englman teaches "a processor," "a determining unit," and a "memory allocation unit" as recited in claim 9	53
I.	Englman teaches "a non-transitory computer readable recording medium" as recited in claim 10	54
J.	Englman and Ronen teach that the "groups are formed based on receiving a user preference input from at least one of the plurality of users" as recited in claim 11	55
K.	A POSITA would have been motivated to combine Englman, Ronen, and Schulhof	56
	UND V: CLAIM 8 IS RENDERED OBVIOUS BY LMAN, RONEN, SCHULHOF, AND THOMPSON	50
А.	Thompson teaches "controlling a battle …" as recited in claim 8	50

Х.

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	B.	Thompson teaches "transferring a game piece …" as recited in claim 8	61
	C.	A POSITA would have been motivated to combine Englman, Ronen, Schulhof, and Thompson	62
XI.	THE PETITION SHOULD NOT BE DENIED UNDER §§314 OR 325		64
	A.	Section 325(d) Is Inapplicable Because Petition Does Not Assert Art Previously Evaluated by the Office	64
	B.	The Board Should Not Deny Institution Under Section 314(a)	65
XII.	CON	CLUSION	67

DOCKET A L A R M



Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.